

CONTENTS.

	Page.
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	1
Introduction.....	1
The Massachusetts Case.....	2
The South Dakota Case.....	4
Substance of the Answers.....	7
Decisions of the Courts Below.....	9
Points in the Massachusetts Case.....	10
Assignments of Error in the South Dakota Case.....	10
ARGUMENT	13-54
I. These suits are in effect against the United States and therefore not within the jurisdiction of the courts. They seek an injunction which, if granted, will restrain the United States in the use of property, its right to the possession and operation of which is not attacked, and would compel the United States to furnish service at risk of loss on rates it has superseded.....	13-22
II. The purpose and effect of said Joint Resolution and Proclamation was completely and exclusively to vest the possession and control of defendants' telephone systems in the President through the Postmaster General as his appointee on behalf of the United States.....	22-26
III. The taking possession and assuming control and operation by the President under the joint resolution of July 16, 1918, constituted said systems public utilities operated by the Government, and made it the right and duty of the President and his representatives to fix the charge to be paid for service.....	26-38

II

ARGUMENT—Continued.

Page.

<p>IV. The proviso to the resolution respecting the laws and powers of the States in relation to taxation or the lawful police regulations of the several States do not apply to and cover either the taxation of the United States or the regulation of prices to be charged by it for its operation of said property.....</p>	<p>38-42</p>
<p>V. The lawful police regulations of the several States which are not affected by the resolution of July 18, 1918, are the police regulations in their strict and accurate sense, and do not embrace the exercise of powers falling under the definition of police powers in their broader sense.....</p>	<p>42-49</p>
<p>VI. The debate on this resolution in the Senate sustains the view that the words "lawful police regulations" were used in the ordinary and primary sense.....</p>	<p>50-52</p>
<p>VII. The provisions of State statutes providing for the regulation of rates charged by private persons and corporations operating public utilities do not by their terms apply to rates charged by agents of the Government in the operation of such utilities at the cost of the United States.....</p>	<p>52-54</p>
<p>CONCLUSION.....</p>	<p>54</p>

CASES CITED.

	Page.
<i>Alabama ex rel. J. Q. Smith, Attorney General v. Albert S. Burleson, as Postmaster General, et al</i>	31
<i>Atchison, T. & S. F. Ry. Co. v. United States</i> , 225 U. S. 640, 649.....	29
<i>Attorney General v. Edison Telephone Co. of London, L. R. 6 Q. B. 244</i>	34
<i>Belknap v. Schild</i> , 161 U. S. 10.....	15
<i>Bluefield Water Works v. City of Bluefield</i> , 70 S. E. (W. Va.) 772.....	44
<i>Chicago, etc., R. Co. v. Milwaukee</i> , 97 Wis. 4, 8.....	45
<i>Cooley on Taxation</i> (3d ed.), 822.....	39
<i>Cunningham v. Macon & Brunswick R. R. Co.</i> , 109 U. S. 446, 456.....	17
<i>East Tenn., Va. & Ga. Ry. Co. v. Morristown</i> , 35 S. W. (Tenn.) 771.....	39
<i>Ex parte Milligan</i> , 4 Wall. 2.....	28
<i>Federalist</i>	27
<i>Freund on Police Power</i> , Sec. 10.....	44
<i>Gedge v. Shoenberger</i> , 83 Ky. 91, 94.....	39
<i>Goldberg v. Daniels</i> , 231 U. S. 218.....	15
<i>Home Tel. Co. v. Los Angeles</i> , 211 U. S. 273.....	45
<i>Hopkins v. Clemson College</i> , 221 U. S. 636.....	16
<i>International Postal Supply Co. v. Bruce</i> , 194 U. S. 601.....	15
<i>Interstate Com. Comm. v. Balto., etc., R. Co.</i> , 145 U. S. 263.....	49
<i>Jacksonville v. Southern Tel. & Tel. Co.</i> , 49 So. (Fla.) 509.....	44
<i>Legal Tender Cases</i> , 12 Wall. 457.....	28
<i>License Tax Cases</i> , 5 How. 504, 582-583.....	43
<i>Louisiana v. McAdoo</i> , 234 U. S. 627.....	15
<i>McDonald v. Hovey</i> , 110 U. S. 619, 628.....	49
<i>McLeod v. New England Tel. & Tel. Co.</i>	20, 25
<i>Manigault v. Springs</i> , 199 U. S. 473, 481.....	44
<i>Mills v. Chicago</i> , 127 Fed. 731.....	44
<i>Minneapolis v. Street Ry. Co.</i> , 215 U. S. 417.....	45
<i>Minnesota v. Hitchcock</i> , 185 U. S. 373, 387.....	